

REPORT/RECOMMENDATION TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
OF SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY, CALIFORNIA
AND RECORD OF ACTION

53

July 8, 2003

FROM: DENNIS HANSBERGER, Chairman
Board of Supervisors

SUBJECT: RESOLUTION OPPOSING THE CALIFORNIA TELECOMMUNICATIONS
INDUSTRY RECOMMENDED ALTERNATIVES TO THE 909 AREA CODE
EXPANSION

RECOMMENDATION: Adopt resolution opposing the California Telecommunications Industry recommended alternatives to the 909 area code expansion, and recommend Alternative #1 where the existing 909 area code and the new 951 area code be essentially divided by the counties of San Bernardino and Riverside county boundaries.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION: The California Telecommunications Industry (Industry) estimates the 909 area code will run out of phone numbers during the fourth quarter of 2003. The Industry is composed of current and prospective telecommunications carriers operating in, or considering operations within, the 909 area code of California. The Industry considered seven different alternatives and is now proposing two of these alternatives for consideration by the California Public Utilities Commission. (See attached maps displaying alternatives #1, #6, and #7.) The California Public Utilities Commission has requested input from local communities and local government officials.

The Industry's recommended proposals include:

- Alternative #6: A generalized overlay, superimposed over the existing 909 area code region. All existing customers would retain the 909 area code and would not have to change their telephone numbers. All customers (both in the 909 area code and a new 951 area code) would be required to dial 1+10 digits for all local and toll calls.
- Alternative #7: An area code split roughly along the San Bernardino and Riverside county boundaries. San Bernardino County would keep the 909 area code, but Riverside County would receive the new 951 area code. This proposed geographic split, however, would also include the City of Yucaipa and communities of Oak Glen, Forest Falls, and Angelus Oaks in the new 951 area code.

The recommended Resolution would oppose both of these alternatives. Alternative #6 would make local calls more difficult to dial and would be cumbersome for the users.

Record of Action of the Board of Supervisors

53

**RESOLUTION OPPOSING THE CALIFORNIA TELECOMMUNICATIONS INDUSTRY
RECOMMENDED ALTERNATIVES TO THE 909 AREA CODE EXPANSION**

July 8, 2003

Page 2 of 2

53

Alternative #7 would be an extreme hardship for residents of the City of Yucaipa and communities of Oak Glen, Forest Falls, and Angelus Oaks. This would put these residents in a long distance calling area separate from large portions of the County. Emergency services and, in many cases, employment and local services would be long distance calls for these residents.

The County of San Bernardino recommends Alternative #1, of the alternatives considered by the Industry. Alternative #1 would essentially split the area code along the counties of San Bernardino and Riverside county boundaries. This alternative would provide for all of San Bernardino County to retain the 909 area code and use the seven-digit dialing that is currently in use. This alternative would include the City of Calimesa in the 909 area code since it, the City of Yucaipa, and the communities of Oak Glen, Forest Falls, and Angelus Oaks make up the "Calimesa Rate Center." For simplicity, the lines splitting the area code should include complete rate centers; therefore, this alternative would give the City of Calimesa a different area code from the rest of Riverside County. However, the City of Calimesa has approximately 7,300 residents, whereas the City of Yucaipa alone has approximately 43,500 residents. San Bernardino County residents make up the vast majority of the "Calimesa Rate Center." Alternative #1 would, therefore, adversely impact fewer residents.

The projected life of the 909 area code is 7 years, and the projected life of the 951 area code is 12 years for both alternative #7 and #1.

If adopted, the resolution would be forwarded to the California Public Utilities Commission, which will determine the disposition of this matter. The California Public Utilities Commission plans to hold meetings during the month of July for public input. A decision is expected by the end of 2003.

REVIEW BY OTHERS: This item was reviewed by County Counsel (Rex Hinesley, Chief Deputy County Counsel) on July 2, 2003.

FINANCIAL IMPACT: There is no financial impact to adopting this resolution.

SUPERVISORIAL DISTRICT(S): All.

PRESENTER: Dennis Hansberger, Chairman, Board of Supervisors (387-4855).

53